

Political.

From the Ohio State Journal.

NEBRASKA and LECOMPTON
1854 and 1858.

While the *Statesman* and kindred papers are urging the antagonism of Lecompton Democracy, we think it well to remind readers of the danger, that, after all, they may fall back into submission to the viceroyal despotism which now seeks to force Lecompton upon them. The opposition to the braska bill was hardly less unanimous in the North, than is opposition to the Lecompton bill now, and that the force

through Congress of the former was a greater practical wrong than the forcing through of the latter, all can see. The repeal of the Missouri prohibition denied the fundamental doctrine of Democracy, that the natural rights of men are equal, and derived from the Creator himself. By raising slavery to an equality with Freedom, as an

violated a sacred compact, sanctioned origin, by consent, and by time, and it voted a new Territory to intestine strife, foreign invasions, to licentious rapine, murderous outrage, as the theatre of a test between a people struggling to establish free institutions, and the agents of

The Lecompton Bill is intended to summate the purpose of the Nebraska bill by establishing slavery in the territory created to freedom by the Missouri Protection. But thanks to the noble and

The Lecompton Bill is intended to summate the purpose of the Nebraska act establishing slavery in the territory created to freedom by the Missouri Provision. But thanks to the indomitable of the free State men in Kansas—thanks to the good God who has no attribute who takes sides with the propagandists of Slavery, it seems now *impossible* that Slavery shall be *established* in Kansas. If the common bill shall pass Congress, the Kansas Legislature and State officers elect

a decided majority on the 4th of Jan will undoubtedly take possession of the State Government. Those State officers and a large majority of the Legislature free State men, elected expressly for the purpose of preventing the Leecompton constitution from being imposed on an unwilling people.

decided majority on the 4th of Jan-
uary will undoubtedly take possession of
the State Government. Those State
and a large majority of the Legisla-
ture free State men, elected expressly for
the purpose of preventing the Lection-
ary constitution from being imposed on an
unwilling people.

To accomplish the purpose of their
action, no way seemed so plain as to
organizing the State Government under
the constitution, hateful as it is, and then
calling an actual convention to re-
peal it, by framing and submitting to the
people a new constitution. This new con-
stitution will no more require any sanction

Congress than did the new constitution of Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the only thing—organization, form of convention, bill, election of members of constitution, framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—can be accomplished in three months.

Congress than did the new constitution of Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of constitution, bill, election of members of constitution, framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—can be accomplished in three months. We do not stop now to discuss the various objections to this proceeding. We considered them carefully, and are satisfied that they amount to nothing.

These things being so, it is as unnecessary that the passage of the Levee ton bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The

Congress than did the new constitution of Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of convocation, election of members of constitution, framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—can be accomplished in three months. We do not stop now to discuss the various objections to this proceeding. We considered them carefully, and are satisfied that they amount to nothing. These things being so, it is as clear as noonday that the passage of the Leaton bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The former will indeed be a great wrong, but will be barren. The latter was a wrong, and was prolific of other wrongs. The former will stand a blackening of infamy; the latter is a fever, poisoned at its source, flowing on, and carrying everywhere disease and death.

And now let us compare the present

Congress than did the new constitution of Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of convention, election of members of constitution, framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—can be accomplished in three months. We do not stop now to discuss the various objections to this proceeding. We considered them carefully, and are so sure that they amount to nothing.

These things being so, it is as clear as noonday that the passage of the Lecompton bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The former will indeed be a great wrong, but will be barren. The latter was a great wrong, and was prolific of other wrongs. The former will stand a blackening of name; the latter is a blot upon the government of infamy; the latter is a foul stain upon the soil, poisoning the soil, flowing on and carrying off everywhere disease and death.

And now let us compare the present consequences of the two measures upon the politicians and parties, and party organization. In 1854 the so-called Democratic party in Ohio was as unanimous against Nebraska as it is now against Lecompton. Let us turn to Democratic memories with a few quotations. On the 3d of February, 1854, the editor of the *Advertiser* uttered itself in this manner:

Ohio than did the new constitution. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of convocation, election of members of constitution, framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—can be accomplished in three months. We do not stop now to discuss the objections to this proceeding. We considered them carefully, and are satisfied that they amount to nothing.

These things being so, it is as clear as noonday that the passage of the Lecompton bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The former will indeed be a great wrong, but will be barren. The latter was a wrong, and was prolific of other wrongs. The former will stand a blackening merit of infamy; the latter is a felon poisoned at its source, flowing on and carrying everywhere disease and death.

And now let us compare the probable consequences of the two measures upon politicians and parties, and party organization. In 1854 the so-called Democratic pro-Ohio was as unanimous against Nebraska as now against Lecompton. Let us Democratic memories with a few quotations. On the 3d of February, 1854, the *Wesleyan Advertiser* uttered itself in this language:

"This bill will undoubtedly open up the whole of slavery agitation—a thing much to be deprecated. Although not directed by anything approved of *Free Soilers*, we have no desire to see any *Democratic* men compromised in the least. We have been tranquilized at the day, violently and angrily excited sentiment. It should be held sacred, in order that it may be preserved."

And again in the same article:

"In the Baltimore Platform—a Platform well approved—we were given to understand that the only party pledged to an election of all the officers and members of Congress, was the party of agitation. Yet no speaker in the public place

Congress than did the new constitution.
Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of convention, election of members of constitutional framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—it can be accomplished in three months. We do not stop now to discuss those objections to this proceeding. We considered them carefully, and are satisfied that they amount to nothing.

These things being so, it is as unnecessary that the passage of the Lecomton bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The former will indeed be a great wrong, will be barren. The latter was a wrong, and was prolific of other wrongs. The former will stand a blackening of name of infamy; the latter is a fact poisoned at its source, flowing on and carrying everywhere disease and death.

And now let us compare the consequences of the two measures upon politicians and parties, and party organizations. In 1854 the so-called Democratic party in Ohio was as unanimous against Nebraska as it is now against Lecompton. Let us turn to Democratic memories with a few quotations. On the 3d of February, 1854, the editor of the *Advertiser* uttered itself in this manner:

"The bill will undoubtedly open up the way of slavery agitation—a thing which no prudent statesman would wish to see introduced. Free Soilmen, we have no desire to any longer touch the Missouri Compromise. It was an olive branch brought down from the clouds of sectional sentiment. It SHOULD BE HELD SACRED, as citizens should hold their tongues."

And again in the same article:

"In the Baltimore Platform—a Platform we all approved—we were given to understand that the country party objected little to opposition of all agitators. Yet so soon is the public opinion excited a healthy tone, that the ground work is laid for such a contest as will sweep virtuous men adorned with every virtue but compromise from office."

And thus spoke the Dayton *Ad-*
vertiser about the same time.

"If the doctrine of the Missouri Compromise for free men in 1846, it is good for Nebraska in 1854," says a contemporary writer, "is not to be regarded as a settlement of a much vexed question, it is a mere admission that there are still such a host of the man compromisers between his own conscience and the slave trade, who feel that their enactment is a solemn farce. What the false doctrine has done for the slave is to make him

Congress than did the new constitution Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of convention, election of members of constitutional framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—all must be accomplished in three months. We do not stop now to discuss the objections to this proceeding. We have considered them carefully, and are satisfied that they amount to nothing.

These things being so, it is as clear as noonday that the passage of the Lection bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The former will indeed be a great wrong, but will be barren. The latter was a wrong, and was prolific of other wrongs. The former will stand a blackeningment of infamy; the latter is a fever-poisoned at its source, flowing on and carrying everywhere disease and death.

And now let us compare the consequences of the two measures upon politicians and parties, and party organizations.

In 1854 the so-called Democratic pro-Ohio was as unanimous against Nebraska as it now against Leecompton. Let us look at some Democratic memories with a few quotations.

On the 3d of February, 1854, the *Prose Advertiser* uttered itself in this manner:

"This bill will undoubtedly open up the whole of our country to the greatest degree open country, although not limited with anything approximating *Free Soilism*, we have no desire to see any territory opened up to such a state of civilization as would be the result of the introduction of the race, violently and angrily excited against it. It would be nearly impossible to settle this fact."

And again in the same article:

"In the Baltimore Platform—a Platform we had approved—we were given to understand that the entire continent belonged to the white man, and that agitation. Yet no answer is the public pulse quickened by the thought of the future of agitation on a grand scale. It does seem to men endowed with every virtue but common sense."

And thus spoke the Daytonites about the same time.

"The doctrine of the Missouri Compromise has been repudiated by the Nebraska Legislature, a compromise is once fairly entered into, and it is to be regarded as a settlement of a question raised by us. If it is admitted that the Missouri Compromise is not the main compromise between the South and the North, it is admitted that Douglas' bill may be none other than to say, that Congress will, without any real bill, establish the new free zone, and thus nullify the doctrine of the Missouri Compromise."

And the Ironton Spirit of the Times of the 24th of January, 1854, said:

"This, we believe, is the first distinctly avowed step towards the admission of slavery into free territory." "It is a significant sign of the times, however, many well-informed persons who sit in Congress, have no more power to slave than to make a king."

The *Lima Argus* spoke out in the following manner:

Congress than did the new constitution of Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of convocation, election of members of constitutional convention, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—all can be accomplished in three months.

We do not stop now to discuss the various objections to this proceeding. We have considered them carefully, and are satisfied that they amount to nothing.

These things being so, it is as clear as noonday that the passage of the Lection bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The former will indeed be a great wrong, but will be barren. The latter was a wrong, and was prolific of other wrongs. The former will stand a blackening name of infamy; the latter is a fever-poisoned at its source, flowing on, and carrying everywhere disease and death.

And now let us compare the probable consequences of the two measures upon politicians and parties, and party organizations.

In 1854 the so-called Democratic party of Ohio was as unanimous against Nebraska as it is now against Lection. Let us turn to Democratic memories with a few quotations.

On the 3d of February, 1854, the *Commonwealth Advertiser* uttered itself in this manner:

"The bill will undoubtedly open up the whole of slavery agitation—a thing much to be deplored even, although not identical with anything appearing in *Freedom's*, or hereinafter in the columns of the *Massachusetts Centinel*. It was an olive branch thrown out to the South, and would have been well received if it had been held sacredly, in strictest confidence." &c.

And again in the same article:

"In the Dallas Platform—a Platform we have approved—we were given to understand that the credit party pledged itself in an opposition of all sorts except such as would be to the public praise exhibit a healthy tone; but the ground work is for agitation on a grand scale, and does not intend to stop at moderate compromise because of our own uncharitable jealousy. What the fate Douglas' plan may be we are not able to say, but that Congress has determined to pass the bill, and the generation of the new territory that does not care for the interests of the Missouri Compromise."

And the Ironist Spirit of the Times, of the 24th of January, 1854, said:

"This, we believe, is the first distinctly avowed step towards the movement to make the whole of slavery into free territory"—adding significantly that "there is no reason to suppose that any man who holds that Congress has no more power to slave than to make a king!"

The *Lima Argus* spoke out in a similar way after this fashion in January 1854:

"All that is asked, as far as Nebraska is concerned, is that she shall be made a Territory, and not a State. That pledge was given about twenty years ago, and it is expected that it will be maintained."

The *Catholic Sentinel* on the 8th of February, 1854, thus declares itself:

"It is very right and just to give the Missouri question its full consideration, and to decide whether it should be lived up to at the present time. We do not think it wise to do so at this juncture. It is only to be decided by their votes to keep alive the Missouri question."

Congress than did the new constitution of Ohio. It will be in force from the moment it is adopted by the people; and the thing—organization, form of convention, election of members of constitution, framing, and adoption of the new constitution, and organization of government—will be accomplished in three months. We do not stop now to discuss the objections to this proceeding. We considered them carefully, and are satisfied that they amount to nothing.

These things being so, it is as unnecessary that the passage of the Lecompton bill will be a less evil than was the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. The error will indeed be a great wrong, and will be barren. The latter was a wrong, and was prolific of other wrongs. The former will stand a blackening of infamy; the latter is a fever-poisoned at its source, flowing on and carrying everywhere disease and death.

And now let us compare the probable consequences of the two measures upon politicians and parties, and party organizations.

In 1854 the so-called Democratic party in Ohio was as unanimous against Nebraska as it is now against Lecompton. Let us compare Democratic memories with a few quotations. On the 3d of February, 1854, the *Northwestern Advertiser* uttered itself in this manner:

"This bill will undoubtedly open up the whole of our agricultural territory to the influence of an alien race, and, although not clothed with anything approaching solemnity, we have no desire to see any restriction placed upon the free settlement of the territory, and we are tranquilized in the fact, violently and angrily expressed, that it is such an alien race, in relation of this fact."

And again in the same article:

"In the Baltimore Platform—a Platform we have approved—we were given to understand that the crafts party pledged itself to an opposition of all legislation. Yet no sooner is the public pulse excited by a healthy tone than the ground work is laid for agitation on a grand scale. It does seem to me that men are endowed with every virtue but common sense."

And thus spoke the Dayton *Advertiser* about the same time.

"If the doctrine of the Missouri Compromise for Oregon is true, it is good for Nebraska in 1854, as a compromise is once fairly entered into, and it is as good for us as for them. If it is not true, we wish to see it adhered to faithfully and honestly; such is not the case, compromises become a man's word, and the people are deceived. The Douglas bill may be wrong we are not able to say, but the Constitution will require to pass any bill for the organization of the new territory that does not rest on the doctrine of the Missouri Compromise."

And the *Ironston Spirit* of the *Advertiser* of the 24th of January, 1854, said:

"This, we believe, is the first distinctly avowed act of the Government in violation of the principle of allowing into free territory—adding significantly—'whereas, we are, however, many well-informed and patriotic men, having to pass any bill for the organization of the new territory that does not rest on the doctrine of the Missouri Compromise.'"

The *Lima Argus* spoke out in reference to this fashion in January 1854:

"All that is asked, as far as Nebraska is concerned, is that the Government should not violate the principle of 1820. That pledge was given most solemnly and it is respected what it will be maintained."

The *Catholic Sentinel* on the 8th of February, 1854, thus declares itself:

"It is well right and just to save the Missouri territory from a worse fate than it has met and just should be lived up to at the present time. We are not in favor of Nebraska."

AND SUBSCRIBED BY THOMAS VINTAGE TO KEEP SLAVE LABOR FROM BEING INTRODUCED.

from 1893.